

# HORIZON

**The magazine  
of useful and  
intelligent living**

*Spiritual fact in a material  
World*

MAY

1943

**Articles by MANLY PALMER HALL** *Philosopher*

## CONTENTS MAY 1943 ISSUE

An identifying footnote to each article indicates whether it is an original article, a condensation from a Manly Palmer Hall lecture, or an excerpt from his writings. *Suggested Reading* is a guide to his published writings on the same or a related subject. A list of Manly Palmer Hall's published works will be mailed on request.

SPIRITUAL FACT IN A MATERIAL WORLD.....	1
<i>"CRADLE TO GRAVE TO PIGEONHOLE"</i>	
<i>An Editorial</i> .....	13
IMMANUEL KANT: <i>On Pure Reason</i> .....	17
THE ABSOLUTE STANDARD OF BEAUTY.....	25
PRACTICAL RELIGION IN THE WORLD OF TOMORROW.....	26
WALLACE'S 'SCREWY' IDEAS.....	32

## o o o o o HORIZON o o o o o

Published monthly by HORIZON PUBLISHING Co., 3341 Griffith Park Boulevard. Los Angeles, Calif.  
35c a Copy, \$4 a Year. Two Subscriptions, Your Own and a Gift Subscription, \$7.

Entered as second-class matter, July 31, 1942 at the Post Office  
at Los Angeles, Calif., under the Act of March 3, 1879

Entire Contents Copyright by Manly Palmer Hall

For permission to reprint or to translate address The Editor of HORIZON

No consideration can be given to manuscripts submitted for publication.

Subscribers ordering a change of address must observe the requirement of two weeks' notice.  
Please give both the new and old address. Numbers missed can not be supplied after 30 days.



# HORIZON

The magazine  
of useful and  
intelligent living

MAY 1943

VOLUME 2 No. 9



- *Aware of the basic patterns of life, we can reduce to a cosmic pattern almost any chaotic problem that may arise*

## Spiritual Fact In A Material World

SOME years ago the great mathematician of electrical engineering, Dr. Hugo Stienmetz, said that we would never fully embrace the field of economic research until we accept the challenge of the spiritual realm that lies beyond the material world. Such a thought, when expressed by a man who was then regarded and is still regarded as one of the great motivating geniuses of modern world industrial achievement, reminds us that spiritual values are recognizable not only by the abstract thinker, but by the concrete thinker as well.

The challenge emerges clearly when a mind has explored physical substance to its abstract ultimates. Electricity is possibly the most attenuated form of matter. It brings the savant face to face with that line that connects the seen and unseen. No one can be more aware of spiritual facts than the person who has explored the universe of the material to its circumference.

As we come to the end of matter, we become aware of tremendous intangible and invisible substances that are pressing down upon it, permeating every part of it, activating it with the most subtle forms of energy. The average individual may accept the spiritual realities in

an abstract way, but the man working in the laboratory finds more and more tangible evidence of the reality of these overtones.

The musician depends largely upon overtones for the finished result of his artistic endeavor. He realizes that these overtones, rising octave after octave, each overtone with its own overtones, is a challenge in harmonics. Even if it is susceptible of mathematical analysis, it is still a strange mystery, something that we do not fully comprehend.

Everywhere in life are these overtones, some of them rising from our material effort as in the case of music, while others seem to descend from some supernatural source, coming down as a benediction upon material surfaces. We live in a sphere of intangibles. The things we most desire to know, the impulses which most profoundly affect us, the thoughts by which humanity is most deeply inspired, all of these come from an abstract, intangible world to impinge such impulses upon our tangible living, to mold us and intensify us with forces of which we have little understanding.

Realizing this, we can accept and understand the value of spiritual realities; even though these realities are what we call abstractions. A great degree of difference lies between the impractical ab-



stractions and those spiritual facts which are not really abstractions at all, but rather intangibles.

Today we are inclined to regard as impractical and useless—or at least only slightly useful—forces that are beyond our comprehension. What we do not sufficiently realize is, that each of us is suspended, like a little marionette figure, by these threads of intangibles, and that every motion we make, every impulse that flows through us, flows into our physical capacity from abstract spheres of energy. The modern electrical research worker, physicist and astronomer, men peculiarly fitted to deal with these abstractions, know that before they can claim to have achieved the ends of their sciences they must accept this challenge of intangibles, work with and solve the mysteries of formal energy as earnestly as they now study the material world consequences of that energy.

Toward practical solution of the problems one great universal fact gives guidance of great importance; and that is, in energy and in life all patterns follow organized laws; there are no exceptions, and no accidents. There is no chaos in the cosmic reality. Everything that occurs in Nature occurs according to established pattern and laws. We have therefore but to become aware of the basic pattern of life to reduce to a cosmic pattern almost any chaotic problem that may arise in our environment or in ourselves.

The ancient philosophers recognized the necessity for what they termed the categories. Categories were orders, patterns, systems. They were the basic plans by which various forms of energy carried on function and manifestation. Everything in Nature falls into a category. Similarly, pattern extends through the problem of human beliefs. People belonging to a great many different religious beliefs rest upon these beliefs; yet they descend from their level of personal conviction. Each individual who makes up a congregation of a great church has certain personal convictions; he interprets the dogma peculiar to his

faith according to certain experience patterns. Members of various faiths may believe firmly that they differ in their opinions, but if we examine we will discover that whether Methodist, Presbyterian, Unitarian, or Agnostic, all believe basically the same thing. Although divided by their creedal organizations, by personal experience these individuals have come ultimately to the same conclusions. Regardless of the doctrine as formal groups, individuals within these organizations interpret basic dogma in terms of personal experience, thus arriving at categories. Once we ignore the artificial barriers which these people have built up by creedal affiliation, we discover they are approaching life in identically the same way.

If we talk to some elderly deacon we might find that basically he is Socratic; he does not realize this, but he belongs to the Skeptic school of philosophy. Twenty years ago he left a conservative group and chose, say, the Congregational group, and he has found it a more liberal church in which to worship. If you told him this is because he is Socratic by temperament, and therefore a Pagan, he would be horrified, and probably would never speak to you again. To him, what you might call Socratic thinking is merely his personal conclusion, out of what experience has actually taught him.

Another elder who is a product of another series of background incidents probably walks beside him down the aisle when the collection is taken. This other is by basic experience a Confucianist. He was born in the Middle West, and he may or may not have heard of Confucius, but that is not important; he is a Confucianist; he runs his home that way. He has read his bible every week, but everything he has read in that bible has made him a Confucianist, just as everything his fellow deacon has read has made him Socratic.

In the same group, without realizing it, the preacher is a Taoist. He does not know it, and would collapse in complete mortification if anyone told him; but





regardless of what he calls himself he is still a Taoist, because his life experience has been a kind of dreamy, abstract, mystical experience; he has a great love for his fellow creatures, but has a curious abstractness about him—and that, when you break it down and classify it, it is definitely Taoistic.

Suppose you go through the congregation and examine the pew holders. Occupying one of the favored pews as the head of a family is a man who has spent most of his life studying nature problems, particularly in the field of horticulture. He is a man of the earth. He has no realization whatever that basically he is a Pantheist, a Nature Worshiper. To him, all trees and plants have very great significance, and as a very devout man he has read his bible every morning, finding in the good book proof of the vitality of his own Pantheistic conclusions.

Two or three pews back is an elderly physician. He does not know it, but he is a Buddhist; and so on. In that church are representatives in varying degrees of development of practically every belief and philosophy known to man. Nominally all of them are Congregationalists, but not one has ever examined into the basic pattern of his own ideas. The one book, the bible, which they hold in common, has proved to each one of them that which he himself has believed. Each is quite certain that he is a good pious Christian, and if he actual-

ly really lives what he believes, the chances are he is; because after all, Christian morality is not sectarian, but a basic emphasis upon the practice of the virtues. Whatever the impulse that leads us to the practice of the virtues, that impulse is our spiritual pattern. It is part of us and we are part of it, and it is intrinsic to us as our very life. We may never define it—possibly it is better that we do not—but whatever it is, it is the medium or vehicle by which we are carried toward the Reality.

In Northern Asia there is a school of Buddhist thought called the Mahayana School. Mahayana means the great cart, a large wagon, and the basic teaching is that it is by a vehicle that the individual is carried across the interval between ignorance and wisdom. The vehicle is represented as boundless as Space itself, each human being having his own cart to make the journey in his own way. The farmer coming close to the earth comes close to Reality. The painter absorbing himself in the object of his own artistic production finds Reality. The basic purpose which motivates each of us can be the cart by which we travel toward identity with Reality. So, in an assemblage in a Christian church on Sunday morning each of many people can be sitting in his own little cart guiding his vehicle toward the Reality for which he is searching. With such a realization comes a better understanding of what constitutes a world religion.

Syria in the era of the advent of Jesus held a number of great teachers. Some had lived a few centuries earlier, and others were to live a few centuries later, but in a period of about five hundred years several great schools of thought arose in the Near East. Some of these schools vanished and no trace of them remains; others struggled along with an inadequate existence; but from them all have emerged the great groups in society.

China produced five hundred sages, but only one Confucius, one Lao-Tze, and one Mencius.

From a great body of schools India has produced saints, doctrines, and dogmas for thousands of years, but Gautama



Buddha emerges as the great teacher of India.

Persia had prophets, Iran was rich in great schools of thought; Zoroaster emerged triumphantly.

There were six hundred philosophers in Greece, why is Plato the one name that everybody knows? And why were Pythagoras and Aristotle the next most important, and maybe Socrates? Others of great importance in their own time have not made an impression. One of the greatest of all the Greek intellects was that of Speusippus, and no one has even heard of him; and why not? The answer is this:

Men of great minds who have lived at various times have expressed in words or teachings, or left behind in the fragments of their own writings or the writings of their disciples, basic categories of human life and thought, and those basic categories have caused their authors to emerge because there were great blocks of humanity who thought the same way. In the experience of living, man has discovered Plato because the average individual working with the problems of life comes to the same conclusion that Plato came to—maybe not so complete as to conclusion, but in ideals parallel. It is because a great number of people of political integrity have found out the same thing Plato found out, that Platonism has emerged as a category, is a basic principle of philosophy. Children are born into the world as potential Platonists, but are not born into the world as potential disciples of Speusippus, because the Speusippian doctrine was a very involved, and very profound; an abstract philosophy, it was not in a great category. Very few people would come to the conclusion themselves, but millions of individuals are born Platonists, or Confucianists, or Taoists. The great religious systems represent the natural instincts of individuals.

Thus we may be born in any part of the world and by instinctive and intellectual structure belong to a religion on the opposite side of the world. I recall reading a sermon by an old theologian which was a bitter attack upon Asiatic



thought. The preacher reminded the pious reader that if there was anything worse than Mohammedans—and they were the curse and nemesis of the early church—it would be the Buddhists, because obviously the Anti-Christ had established this entire Asiatic civilization for the purpose of destroying the world. Settling down to the matter of proving this, he got very heated in his discussion. Ecclesiastical procedure has a novel way of proving things — no doubt you are aware of this technique. But, as he set to work to prove clearly the correctness of his assumption, what he did not know was, his entire approach to the problem of disproving Buddhism was the Buddhist technique; in other words, he was a Buddhist thinker!

Study of the psychology behind the sermon clearly reveals why he wrote it. Possibly somewhere he once met a religious sea captain who told him something about Buddhism; or maybe somewhere he came across a few scattered books that had something to say about the matter—there was very little written about Buddhism in his time—and unquestionably with him it immediately struck a respondent cord. He had an affinity for it; it was natural to him. Quickly following this strange discordance of consciousness a fine temper set in. He suddenly realized he was a great sinner, because he had taken a fancy to this strange Oriental doctrine. Then he became aware, as only a theologian can become aware, of how insidious and



subtle this doctrine could be, because it tempted him so completely in the first place. He therefore rose in great theological dignity and determination to save his soul and everyone else's. He sermonized because he himself basically agreed with the doctrine he was attacking, for strangely, that is the way these problems work out.

As we study of our beliefs and philosophies of life we realize we are all basically working from patterns, and when we start working we come against a further problem. It takes a considerable courage for anyone who lives in our Christian civilization to forthrightly say, "Obviously, I am a Brahman." That is not only a difficult thing to do, but it might be very unwise to make such outward acknowledgment. But each of us has a pattern of philosophy nevertheless, a pattern that is the true result of our own experience mechanism, and the direct measure of what we have brought forward from other lives when there was no Christian faith and we had to belong to something else. For the last thousand years entities have flowed into the Christian church, two and a quarter billion human beings, who have lived in other civilizations; some have come through Chaldea, some through Egypt, some through Persia, others through India and China, and all of these human beings with thousands of years of cultured tradition behind them emerge into our modern civilization and are forced together in what we call a normal Christian concourse—forced to find satisfaction in the interpretation of one belief. This is not easy. Furthermore, it is not basically necessary. As we get a little wiser in our religious thought we will see the advantage of the spiritual integrity of discovering what we are, for through that discovery we can most quickly approach our own spiritual necessity.

This is one example of what intangibles can do to us, and how these intangibles can press down and distort our tangible living. If we will admit there must be and is a basic pattern in us, we then realize if we build according to

this pattern we build successfully. When we build against this pattern, or confuse it, we complicate the purposes of our own consciousness, thereby creating discord, dissolution, and asymmetry within the basic structure of ourselves.

Invaluable to the individual is some study of his own pattern, and with some study basically of the pattern of world thought. There are books that set forth the tenets of the basic systems of world thought. If you want something comparatively light, there are school textbooks of primary comparative philosophy and religion; a little more advanced is Sir William Hamilton's *History of Metaphysics*, a fine standard work which contains a brief of practically all of the great classical systems of thought. You will discover one for which you feel the most natural mental response. One will to you merit further consideration, as the one that most intrigues your consciousness. Select without asking yourself or anyone else which one you should choose, in the sense of helping you to fit into any social pattern. Instead, permit the one that has an affinity for you to establish itself. You will instinctively select that which is nearest to your own viewpoint. This will be the one you will understand, that will talk your language; you will see in it the justification of your own personal conviction. Having fundamentally discovered the nature of this and the pattern, the task is then to keep clear the stream of your own convictions, letting nothing in but that which is compatible. Your progress can be confused by what the Latins called eclecticism, the poor man's philosophy. If you mentally wander about, picking up a bit here and a bit there, you need not expect to get anywhere. Begin by selecting that which is next





and useful, and then build into it step by step that which is the completeness of its own pattern. Accept the challenge of thought-continuity, and build forward to it. This does not mean you should develop intolerances toward the opinions of others, nor does it require that you discontinue the study of various religions and philosophies. What it does mean is, you should always study from a center, and always have something that is essentially your own, something you are building by action, thought and word, something that you are coming to understand more completely because you will understand more about everything in life with the passing of each day.

Our great national difficulty is identical with our great world difficulty; we have no basis on which to build, and without a basic foundation there is no projecting of a goal, without a point of center there is no viewpoint of ultimate conclusions. In our modern world we have no basic denominator, and so we have had no basic common goal. Terrific tension, such as we are in today, will clarify in part the purpose of living, for world thought is now falling into ancient categories and patterns. The very psychologies that dominate Central Europe at the present time were experimented with and rejected as unworkable by great scholars three thousand years ago. All civilizations tried dictatorship, and all found it did not work. Why, then, is the modern world trying it again? It is because as individuals we have built no potential foundation of adequate conviction within ourselves. We have not reasoned ourselves out of the belief that dictatorship will work; and not having clarified the patterns of our own lives, as individuals we are still susceptible to motions of mob psychology, still victims of religious spellbinders, still willing to listen to the biased platitudes of politicians. Lacking foundations and goals, we have been veered about by any breeze that blew.

Now we begin to see emerging from this chaotic condition a hope of a united nation, indicators of a new world trend, the idea that we can combine all peoples

into one big, happy nation. We knew all the time that the policy of a united nation was good; but we never got around to doing anything about it. We accepted it theoretically, but never experimented with humanity under personal procedure, never experimented with the problem of environmental unity in our own life. Our virtues were platitudinous, abstract; we never did anything with them. But our selfishness was concrete, well organized, and well directed.

Why are we much more successful as materialists than we are as spiritually minded people? The reason is obvious: The material span is comparatively short. Whatever we accomplish in the material world we must accomplish in a maximum of not much more than fifty years, because there are hardly more than fifty years between intellectual convictions and material disintegrations. Everything is thus in the terms of imminents. The goal is success; success in tangibles. The dream and hope is of accomplishing what the average individual does not accomplish, and that is, to pass out of this world with enough money left to pay for his own funeral. This is a goal conceived in pride, projected by ambition as a very short pattern but a very intensive one. There are other goals, of course, such as dedication to achieving the first million, or the resolve to become an alderman or a congressman. By willingness to sacrifice for such patterns the individual can achieve these material accomplishments. The dictator impulse is something else; it calls for a continuity of effort possessed by a few; people in general have a lot of impulse but no continuity. If an individual settles down seriously, industriously, and with all his energy to the program of making himself obnoxious, he can do it in a big way. But, it is also true that if he sets himself to some constructive purpose, he can accomplish that; he has only a limited amount of time, but he has a tangible goal, and behind it the weight and support of the social system—for all the world loves a successful man. The same system unhappily holds





up as horrible examples those who have not succeeded, and so it is not long before the man who has gone ahead hypnotizes himself into the belief that everything in Space depends upon his material success in a period of fifty years. His may be an insignificant and inconsequential goal, but it is definitely a goal, and with the material life much better organized than the more abstract in problems, individuals are motivated by the interest in obvious things. Our liking is for the approval that comes with success, for the power that comes with wealth, for the freedom and liberty that come with executive positions. The material life produces material power because it is a short, intensive pattern, well organized. Its definiteness makes it something for which the ambitious man will sacrifice himself and his world. If today's man had convictions as strong as his ambitions we would have the Golden Age now. If individual patterns of internal integrity were as great as those as of external ambition, men would be truly great instead of being merely despotic. Pattern is all important.

Not many realize that in pattern there is a prophetic power. Everything that Nature does is done in an orderly way, and there are no exceptions to any of its laws and motions. The patterns of energy, which is energy flowing through a design, is always going to do the same thing; it is always going to come to the same end; it is always going to fulfill itself. We can thus learn our own destiny by studying the consequences of the same pattern in other things. If as individuals we live according to a certain psychology, we will come to the same individual end that a nation comes to that lives by the same mass psychology. Today we see an example of that in dic-

tatorship. There are two kinds of dictators: political dictators, affecting the destiny of nations; and personal dictators affecting their own lives and the lives of those around them; and both small tyrant and great tyrant come to the same end. The individual who tries to dictate the policy of the crossroad community, and the dictator who tries to direct the course of empire, will eventually find out that anything that will destroy a nation will destroy an individual; anything that will destroy one part of the world will destroy the other part that does the same thing. There is no possibility of the individual being an exception to the category in which he lives; there is no way by which he can do things against his pattern and flourish. It is because most people feel they are exceptions to the general rule that they are led to numerous observable errors in judgment.

The average man will say he would do what is right if he knew what it was. It opens up a very large question. For each individual, right is a very personal matter—it is harmony to pattern and consistency with category. That which is the greatest right is the next thing to do. It is always right to do that which is the next step in the fulfillment of a pattern. To discover that which is next is wisdom. Strength is the courage to do it when you find out what it is, for it seldom happens to be exactly what you want to do at that precise moment. The great conflict between the thing to be done and the thing desired obscures ordinary or everyday vision.

Philosophy is the study of the great forces at work in Nature, and seemingly, this is an abstract knowledge. A person could very well say, "Well, I suppose space, cosmos, time, and eternity are in this pattern, but what does that mean to me? How can I make that work? How can I bridge across between the great abstract, so called, and the little personal problems that sum up to me, as an individual, to not being comfortable? What good is there in becoming a student in abstract systems of learning when my problem is very concrete, the



imminent matter of personal adjustment here and now?" Not infrequently someone says to me: "I would like to be a Platonist, I would even adore to be a Platonist, but at the moment I cannot be a Platonist because I am having domestic difficulties. When I get my domestic difficulties ironed out I will take up the subject of Platonism." And something in this strain is also familiar: "I have a problem of feeding a family, I have to work every day; it would be fine to be a student of Buddhism, but at the present time it seems I must take an evening course in plumbing—because it has practical bearing on my problem, which is to get a defense job." While the individual is spending six weeks in getting a course in plumbing, and the next four weeks in trying to get a birth certificate, someone else comes along to say: "I feel a hankering after Taoism, but at the present time I am having trouble in the home. Now it is quite possible that my family may break up, and if that happens I will find a great deal of comfort in Taoism; just now it is very abstract, because what I am looking for at the moment is a divorce lawyer." Ever in conflict are the abstract and the concrete. "It is abstract that I would like to be a Taoist; it is concrete that I am in a sticky spot now. When I get over it, get everything smoothed out, and life goes on like a song, I will be a Philosopher." This person does not know it, but when he gets it to going like a song he will already be a philosopher!

Great spiritual truths are thought of as a kind of luxury; you can do something with them when other things permit. They come with leisure, they are something to keep us busy in old age, when we can't knit all the time. (It has been discovered incidentally that you can study Taoism and knit at the same time). These laws that are abstract, are something that it is nice to have, like a second language; you might need it sometime. That the abstract is basically solutional now, does not come into people's minds at all. What has to be learned is, the individual needs philos-

ophy for the solution of his problems, and not for some aftermath application. Philosophy is preventive, not curative. People come to religion because they have failed, whereas the function of religion is to prevent the failure in the first place. Instead of gathering up scraps of things and dragging them into church, the problem is to get religion or philosophy so well established that lives do not fall to pieces.

We hold the same attitude toward philosophy and religion as we do toward medicine. Very few people will go to a doctor until they hurt, and hurt badly, and as soon as they stop hurting they do not go any more. What they do not realize is, that pain is only a minor symptom. The Chinese are wiser. The Chinese physician is paid while the patient is well, and loses his pay when the patient is sick. To pay to stay well, and not to get well, is very solid common sense. A periodical fee makes it possible for a man to consult his physician at the slightest provocation. An American has to save up or boldly hazard the family wealth before he can call upon his physician for a once-over, which certainly places a terrific handicap on health maintenance. Some day that will have to be changed, along with other of our phobias. So then, as surely as it is the true purpose of medicine to keep us well, so it is the purpose of philosophy to keep us normal. To use either to reconstruct the wreckage is entirely the wrong approach.

If people would accept philosophy and the spiritual sciences as basic values—as really factual thinking—and, living ac-





cording to these categories, expecting no consequences to be different from their causes and no result different from the factors that produced it, and thus settle down to the problem of normal living, they would not get into a position where they have to gradually reassemble ruined lives.

Our view of spiritual values as luxuries is very much like the concept we have of art, something for the rich, a luxury of life. One of the richest men I have ever known had a magnificent collection of art; he owned it but never really possessed it; because the meaning of art is, beauty belongs to those who love it. No one can prevent a man without a cent from loving beauty.

By beliefs that education belonged to universities and that the country is run by politicians we have taken values away from ourselves. Music, art, and literature belong to those who appreciate them, are demanded by those who need them, they produce only a kind of intellectual toxicity when forced upon someone who does not want them. That is one of the problems we have in education: we educate people in things they do not want, and do not use; they do not mean a great deal to them without the realization that the things which are intangible and abstract are the most practical, the most valuable things in the world; in them is the only correction for the great physical disaster by which we are now afflicted. We will continue to be miserable people as long as we feel physical disasters are real and spiritual preventatives are not real.

Philosophy is supposed to belong to abstract individuals wandering about in a kind of daze. But philosophers are not the individuals you see wandering around on campuses with a far-away look in their eyes. The study of students, the philosophers, is aimed at one thing, a means of accomplishing a justified and meritorious end. They do not study religion or philosophy merely to become aware of these systems of thought; they study for one purpose only, to use knowledge, to apply it to its legitimate end. Says Francis Bacon:

The legitimate end toward which all knowledge is pointed is the improvement of the state of man. And when we accept spiritual values as basically practical, then we can go to work to prevent disaster; and we can go to work sustaining convictions, doing the things we believe and believing the things we do.

Now how can we apply this to the great problems of the moment? The really serious ones at this time are largely international in pattern. One problem is present in young people being taken out of their environments and pressed into military service. It is bringing about three general effects: It is interfering with and changing the direction of higher education, because it is affecting so many young people between ages 19 and 25. The effect of this upon the educational theory is apt to be profound. In a second group are those who were getting started in some commercial or industrial line, or in the various professions. In the majority of cases their jobs are guaranteed, and they will return to their work and continue from where they left off. But there is a catch in that, and it is not as good as it sounds. The catch being, while the law may be fulfilled to the letter and as far as possible to its spirit, the individual is going to lose the time he is away. If his absence is for two years, under normal conditions he might have had a promotion in that time, and that he loses; and with it, two years of experience in his own profession or craft. This cannot be returned to him, he may get it later, but he will be two years behind. He will also have to face the competition of those who would normally be two years behind him, but who were not called for military service. But what is probably most important is, his removal from business habit patterns into which he will have to fit himself again from a different viewpoint. The third problem is the breaking up of homes, many of which have just been started. Very complicated chemical consequences are certain in a later effort to re-establish these homes. These are three aspects of the problem to be faced by



seven or eight million young Americans. In addition, we will have social changes brought about by economic necessity, the employment of women in industry, and numerous other changes that relate to war but produce experiences that survive the war emergency. The war will be over, but the consequences will never be over. In these changes will be the basis of new social patterns, for the world never goes back.

In this instance all are affected by one basic problem, interruption. The effect of this in application to personal life is diversified, for each individual is taken out of the category and pattern he has built up for himself, the flow of energy is interrupted, and he is forced to adapt that energy to other uses, at least temporarily. He will return with an entirely different viewpoint; and in many cases it is doubtful whether he will ever be able to fit back into the old categories. The bank clerk who has known military life for two or three years will not be the same bank clerk he was before. When the man who has never been anywhere goes somewhere he is never again the same man. What we are is based upon our experience, our environment, and the conditioning we have passed through. When that conditioning changes we change. The good old bank job may be waiting for the clerk, and he may not now be interested in it. Even if he goes back to it because of economic necessity he will not fit into it as before, for a new human being is going back to the old job.

The reaction we can look for will be in the change of structure of our profession, because after all these professions are made up of persons who sustain them. If these persons change, policy changes, business perspective changes. Interruption is the one thing that nearly all people fear, and if we fear anything more than interruption it is innovation. We like old shoes because they are comfortable, whereas a new pair of shoes is both a challenge and a discomfort. In our living, once we have by conditioning established ourselves in a pattern, we always fall into that pattern because it is



the one we know and it is comparatively easy for us to work in it. A minimum of mental and vital effort is required to stay where we are, and that is why so many people are "sot" in their ways. Remaining in the little viewpoint means avoidance of the stress of new ideas. New ideas are an innovation, and if we are uncomfortable in new shoes, we are still more uncomfortable with new thoughts. We are afraid of them because we suspect we will have to do something about them if we have them.

The solution is obvious: Do not know much. That is the simple way out. It is in fact the easy way out of all difficulties we have. And yet, the same individual who is afraid of the pain of improvement, is often up to his neck in the pain of insufficiency. He is not happy, not comfortable, he is about as miserable as he can be; but he is afraid of facts because they look as though they might challenge him into a different form of discomfort. This viewpoint is common; but since no one is completely alone or entitled to live his life without considering the consequences upon others, then the only life that is safe is the intelligent life.

That our young men will confront the problem of interruption and innovation I believe to be part of a conspiracy of circumstances that is necessary to the progress of our people. One of the reasons for so much modern day trouble is that most people have no conception whatever of cooperation with others, no understanding of the way other people live and feel. Our entire American way of life has been based upon a selfish program of our own survival and success, and the devil take the hindmost. We have not thought in terms of team-



work, nor in terms of other people's rights and endeavors, even if we have abstractly acknowledged the integrity of the Constitution. Obscuring our view of common rights is our excitement over state rights; we get terrifically worked up about things not so very vital to us, but when it comes to actually living according to the Constitution we do not do it at all. We are totally concerned each with our imminent effort to be happy.

And all this effort we have been making since the beginning of time to be happy has never resulted in happiness; we all come down to some common misfortune in the end. We are now confronted with the general collapse of world policy. The whole theory of world competition, of world trade, of international exploitation, the entire pagantry that we have called our great world economic design for living has fallen apart and to pieces. Reduced to a shambles is that which we built up without benefit of integrity. No one was interested in integrity—that was too abstract. That abstract values are the life behind all concrete form, and without them no form can live, we had not learned. We will have to learn it now the hard way. Realization is at last upon us that this is a complete world collapse which began before the last world war, staggered through the reconstruction period, fell then to the economic collapse and gangsterism, and crashed downward all the way to dictatorship, which emerged, as it always emerges, out of collapse. Chaos ever invites the opportunist. Someone is always ready to capitalize on the confusion of others.

We could experience a complete break down of world policy only because world policy was never in harmony with the pattern; it had not considered natural law, it was indifferent to the way the Universe did things.

Out of the debacle must come something new. First will come something new in man. The old world citizen looking for an opportunity to exploit his neighbor is not the one to usher in a great theme of global existence. He

could not do it, because it does not mean anything to him. New ideas call for new organizations. It requires a new world viewpoint to bring about a new world; and it will not suffice that a half dozen leaders and a few politicians will be telling us how to do it. Humanity is reaching a point of self decision. Average human beings are doing a better job than they have ever done before, and there is increasing awareness that great motions of civilization must come through man, and not to man through divine revelation. And so it is necessary to condition human beings. Nature, interested in only one thing, results, is bringing them about by the only means which Nature knows to assure results. Human beings are not converted by kindness alone. Natural kindness and gentleness, the one thing in this world that should be its great strength, is rejected by a world that needs it badly. The world answers to the big stick. And Nature, when it wants something done, generally gives two warnings and then the wallop.

The first warning was World War I, and it fell on deaf ears. The League of Nations might have done something, but it was not supported; a great dream became a political football.

Nature, having found that a first persuasion had no effect whatsoever, presented us with warning number two, in the form of an economic collapse. It should have proved conclusively that we had failed miserably to adapt Universal Law to individual necessity; but it didn't; we went along with the smug conceit that our economists knew more about the Universe than the Universe knew about itself. They did not know anything. Their economic theory was not in harmony with anything in Nature; it had to fall to pieces.

We ignored two warnings, then came the total collapse, the one we have now.

The one hope we have of being able to meet the challenge of things that are to come is that in some way we shall be conditioned for it—by meat shortages, coupon swapping for canned goods, fresh vegetable and other food shortages,



gas rationing—and by some seven million men knowing that what to them were successful and set careers have been thrown into an amazing pattern of mutual insufficiency. These men who previously had planned to be clerks and small merchants, or workers in this industry or that industry, anything from the manufacturing of shoes to the manufacturing of motion pictures, along with some who were intent on cultivating the ground and others on cultivating the arts—all have suddenly had thrust upon them a conditioning that is absolutely essential to creating the world pattern that is to come. They have been thrown into a close association with other men in patterns of equality; they are going to see the sophisticated lose their sneers; they are going to see humble men come forward; they are going to find out how education and family tradition have made American snobs, and they will know how many snobs there are and why; and all these men will learn of teamwork and danger; and will find out what it means to suffer and endure; and plenty about what Americans have forgotten, how to take orders, by which they learn something of the dignity of life, and the control of the corruption of life. Some things they will see will make them wise, and others will make them mad, but gone will be the onetime idea of a lifetime routine, in which a man would daily go to his job, crab at his boss, come home and read the news or listen to the radio—that little life, that cherished right to do no more than that; he will find it is not as important as he used to think it was! Men will die beside him and about him, in an effort to build a better future. And by this he will know what is meant by United Nations, and a freedom which is not merely the right of the individual to come home and put his feet up, but freedom that recognizes intangible spiritual values as things real and obvious.

There are things for which there can be no substitute in theory. No one

knows the foreign country unless he has been there. No one knows a religion or philosophy unless he has used it. No one realizes what the world is unless he meets it. The only way we can get a reasonable, basic picture of values is to be brought face to face with that which we talk about as collectives and seldom consider as individuals. And now we must know that men of philosophic beliefs and unbeliefs, some constructive, some selfish, some foolish and some wise, most of them pretty badly confused, are the seven million human beings we are depending upon for the preservation of our lives as free people. Right now they are doing their job, whether they want to or not, and their payment and reward is not going to be the pay the army gives them, but the vision this contact with life gives them, the vision by which they can build a new world. It is by decree of Nature that they had to mix and mingle, had to be taken out of their extremes of opinion and brought face to face with life, because they were destined to be the men, and the women, too, who are going to build the commonwealth of nations of which we are dreaming. If they had not gone away they would have sat at their desks and waited for someone else to build that commonwealth, but when they come back they are going to do it themselves. It will be by their demand that the changes will be made that legislators and idealists have been clamoring for, for years. They'll get them too, because they have learned the language that gets things.

Nature, with its wallop, has given us the solution, in a pattern that always works the same way: For the solution for every problem is intrinsic in it.

No man is more impractical than a materialist, because he is working with something that can never win; and none is more practical than the idealist, because he is capable of working with substances that will endure, as he establishes them in world patterns.

(CONDENSATION FROM A PUBLIC LECTURE

*Suggested reading:* HOW TO UNDERSTAND YOUR BIBLE; PURPOSEFUL LIVING  
LECTURES ON ANCIENT PHILOSOPHY; SELF-UNFOLDMENT.)





## "Cradle To Grave To Pigeonhole"

*An Editorial On Premature Burial*

IN the April issue of HORIZON an editorial note accompanied publication in outline of the basic provisions of the "cradle to grave" security plan drawn up by the National Resources Planning Board; and this magazine said, "No document issued within recent years is worthy of more careful study by thoughtful Americans."

The American press in huge majority has not agreed. Comments on the report have ranged from misrepresentation of its contents to cavalier dismissal of the whole thing. It has been dubbed "a grab bag," "the flop of the year," and it has been said of it, because it was announced as the American Beveridge Plan, "this was a whopping misnomer." One news journal that sets itself the task of reflecting nationwide sentiments of the populace reported: "Most citizens read a few paragraphs of the news summaries, then gave up. In bar and barbershop the program went widely undiscussed."

Congressmen, quick to comment, were too quick. Typically, Mississippi's John Rankin blurted out his condemnation for "the most fantastic conglomeration of beaureaucratic stupidity ever sent to Congress," which weighty opinion came within a few hours after the 721-page, 480,000-word report reached Capitol Hill. It isn't possible that he could have read the report, no less studied it, at the time he commented.

Radio and newspaper commentators passed judgment so quickly that they, too, obviously could not have any more than glanced through the summary, one news-sheet jumping to the brainbusting conclusion that it was "a scheme for government control of industry."

Within 72 hours, the Senate without a word of debate, set up its own postwar economic committee, headed by Senator George of Georgia, who said: "About the only thing we can accomplish is to get a start on hearings." This action called for the approving comment by one sector of the press: that "Franklin Roosevelt's plan would merely gather dust in the most respectable of Congressional pigeonholes." Also applauding, one newspaper of huge circulation and consistently anti-administration viewpoint announced: "Congress has determined to write its own formula. This is as it should be."

HORIZON feels this is exactly as it shouldn't be. Congress has neither political disinterestedness, the staff, the freedom from pressure groups, the technical experts, nor the time for the preparation of such a report. Of the plan which has been given to Congress the President said: "To assist the Congress in the development and consideration of appropriate legislation to achieve normal employment... (the plan) reviews the accomplishments and experience of the last ten years, pointing out some of the weaknesses of our security system, and suggesting ways of improving and strengthening the whole program. Because of their basic importance to our national



welfare during the war and after the war, it is my earnest hope that the Congress will give these matters full consideration during this session."

Congress, in no mood for "consideration," has elected to set up its own committee, to announce vaguely that it will "get a start on hearings" presumably to sometime set up its own formula; the Senate, as one approving news comment said, "as one man, turned its face away from the plan." Now, why? It required three years of hard work for the National Resources Planning Board to draw it up, and it represents the thoughtful conclusions of trained economists, reputable business men, and authorities on social security in a realistic study to find the answer to the primary question: How is full employment to be maintained after the war? HORIZON has not seen anywhere publication even of the names or qualifications of those who drew up the report. The Board is headed up by public spirited Frederick A. Delano, who began his career as a railroad machine shop apprentice and worked his way up to the presidency of three railways, who won the D. S. M. for service in France in 1918, and the Legion of Honor, who has served as regent of the Smithsonian Institution, and as agent of the Federal Reserve Bank. At his elbow was Charles E. Merriam, of Chicago, former president of the Social Science Research Council, president of the American Political Science Association. The special committee membership was made up of such men as the specialist in minority groups for the National Defense Commission, a Community Chest leader, a seasoned commissioner of WPA, the executive director of the American Public Welfare Association, the former administrator of the Farm Security Administration, the chief of the U. S. Department of Labor Children's Bureau, the director of research of the Federal Security Agency, and several non-political professional economists. Out of this wide background of knowledge plus experience in administration of both governmental and private welfare, the committee carefully conceived its measures for minimizing booms and depressions, examined a great amount of data accumulated by a special technical staff; its two Advisor members were businessman Henry S. Dennison, a paper manufacturer whose product is a household word, and Beardsley Ruml, author of the most widely discussed of all taxation plans in the category of "pay as you go"; (Ruml's taxation formula, incidentally was rejected by the Senate Finance Committee, and then, despite the Gallup survey's report that 83 per cent of wealthy Americans and 86 per cent of moderate income people favored the Ruml plan, it has been defeated in the House.)

A principal function of Congress ceases when the solons at Washington fail to take a social security report such as this one under full consideration; they are under inescapable obligation to discuss it thoroughly, and after debate, pass judgment on what is good, and suggest whatever modifications seem reasonable. This is their responsibility as the lawmakers for the nation. A foresighted administration has carefully passed along suggestions which it considers are for the public good. The President's note which accompanied the report offers aid toward consideration of the problems: "Executive agencies responsible for the administration of programs in these fields are prepared to provide Congress with all assistance within their power in devising appropriate ways and means to accomplish these high purposes... common determination that work, fair pay, and social security after the war is won must be firmly established for the people." Americans are very much interested in these high purposes, and for Congress to ignore by the pigeonhole method a plan of suggestions devised by exceedingly able men of widely diversified experience motivated by the desire for betterment of the people's affairs, is blatantly unintelligent.

At this enlightened moment in world history it is known to all that the direct cause of our global warfare was the worldwide unemployment which resulted in populace upheavals and the setting up of despotisms and dictatorships. The ab-



solute prerequisite to America lending its aid and counsel to effecting postwar worldwide stability is to provide for a minimum of economic security for each and every one of the citizens of the United States. Not at some future time, but right now, is when we should have, at least in prospect, economic stability within our own borders.

Congress is charged with the duty of enacting laws that express the will of the people. This great debating society is supposed to iron out the kinks in the various proposals that come before it. And the people have the same crosstalk privilege and full freedom to air their views among themselves or in the public prints; what they are supposed to be thinking is thus something called 'news.' But if the distinguishing characteristic of Congressmen is lack of open-mindedness, that same accusation is to be leveled at the press for the way it received the report. It is recognized that newspapers and journals are the moulders of most of the people's opinions, and supposedly supply the citizens with their intellectual leadership; unhappily in this instance they have displayed an almost universal astigmatism in postwar outlook. One of the most widely circulated of our periodicals speaks up in behalf of American citizens that they "rightly suspect all plans which 'guarantee' things." A strange estimate is this indeed of the propensities for cynicism inherent to a people who have long looked to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness as 'guaranteed' by the Constitution. The editorial continues: "The people of this country must be pardoned if they glance through what they can of the tonnage of such reports with a cold and fishy eye."

Well, HORIZON has done more than 'glance through' the report. And examination fails signally to support the press view that the plan puts "most of the emphasis on the ever-increasing role which Government is to play in buttoning up the businessman in the morning and keeping him out of trouble all day long." The plan's major emphasis is unmistakably on Freedom From Want, and has to do with: "The right to security, with freedom from fear of old age, want, dependency, sickness, unemployment and accident." This has required that the problem of postwar rehabilitation be comprehensively covered, but instead of Government taking control of factories, the suggestions are toward enabling measures for getting rid of factories that Government owns right now, seeking not Government "control" of industry, but rather how to get Government *out* of private business. Ah, but!—these plants are not to be sold to the dominating industrialists in each group, but are to be placed out of the reach of monopolists, and put into as many hands as possible, so as to encourage competition! The plan gives equally realistic recognition to the fact that Government is already in certain business fields such as metals production and shipbuilding, and suggests that these war-built properties be turned over in peacetime to corporations that will run them, with Government becoming a shareholder, instead of putting wartime properties built with public money up at auction for whatever they might bring. And very fairly also, the plan proposes that business be assisted in converting back to peace production by allowing corporate reserves to be built up now, under special tax exemption. Rightfully too, it considers dismissal pay for workers when their war jobs end, and provision for any needed vocational re-education, and argues effectively against returned soldiers being dumped on the streets.

But the glance-through critics rise to say that the Board is not specific on the point of when the benefits to individuals are to become effective, and how much in dollars and cents per week the unemployed get—and so, the verdict that this isn't the American Beveridge Plan, for Beveridge stated the case for Britain in shillings and pence and budgetted the whole national expense. Obviously, an American plan couldn't do this. The English are old hands at social security, and Beveridge could concern himself with extension of existing social services, something on



which we have only made a beginning. Britain too has had Royal Commissions investigating and analyzing national problems for years; the British are accustomed to looking at social problems with reason and realism, whereas we are still at the point where at the mere mention of the procedure of "planning" we invest it with furious partisanship.

The two democracies also operate with basic differences. Fresh in our minds is Winston Churchill's recent radio speech, which proved of enormous interest to Americans although it concerned only Britons. The Four Year Plan which he proposed was rooted in a mixed economy for England with peacetime engagement of the nation's entire manpower in a carefully worked out program of meeting national needs in every field, cultural as well as material, with private business allowed to operate where it can most efficiently, but with natural monopolies allocated to public enterprise, and the nation's total production slated to finance total security. Churchill pledged this as the responsible head representing a working majority of his nation's political parties. He spoke as the voice of his government. There is no such thing as an American who could speak for the majority in Congress. And not only have we no one in a position to make a commitment on the most important domestic issue of our time, but, worse still, we have no agreement on the nature of any forthcoming pledge to the people, and as yet no idea even of the when and how of postwar social extension. What we have is an American demobilization program, carefully conceived, approved by the President, and immediately thereafter consigned without examination or debate to a Congressional pigeonhole.

Individual commentators and the majority of influential publications have either applauded this or excused it, for they think they recognize widespread disillusionment among those Americans who thought social improvements would come out of the war; they note how talk about a people's war a few months ago when the military situation looked bad, has died out, and the war has become to the average citizen just another war eventually to be won by the power nations so that old-time traditions can be preserved as they were. They assume no immediate interest by Americans on measures to improve the conditions of living for everyone.

Again, HORIZON dissents. If there is little talk right now of social reform it is because right now just about everybody has social security. There are jobs for all, for \$100,000,000,000 a year is being spent to keep people at work—a fantastic national income figure that has always represented Utopia in the calculations of abundance-economists—and of untimely insignificance perhaps is the concept of later maintaining living standards by assurance of spending one twentieth of this sum in a peacetime year. But, whatever today's indifference, it has no bearing on what will be the public state of mind when the manna of wartime spending ceases to fall. Everybody is living off Government spending now; it will be different when peace comes. People will then too want economically secure and purposeful lives, the right to work and to earn fair pay; they have these things now, and that's the one reason why they are not asking for them now. It is fuzzy thinking to assume that they will be equally content when they do not have them.

It can furthermore be set down as a certainty that in this modern day this country, nor any other country, can not build a stable society without a comprehensive system of mutual security for its citizens. That the people have been prejudiced against the report of the National Resources Planning Board, and that its recommendations have been killed off without public discussion, is an extreme in short-sightedness. Fortunately, the report is accessible to all Americans who care to study it. In abridged form, 58 pages, the recommendations on general policy are given and a summary of specific proposals; the title is, *After the War—Toward Security*; it is obtainable from the National Resources Planning Board, Washington, D. C.



## Kant: *On Pure Reason*



IMMANUEL KANT belongs to the 18th century, which produced the final movement of human wordiness. Those who have read Dickens, Thackeray, and Scott will realize that in their time words were things to conjure with; words embraced infinite detail in truly magnificent vocabularies. This wordiness in literature was consistent with the art and culture of its time. The 18th Century living room had in it as many geegaws as the space would permit; from the wax flowers under the glass bell to the crepe hung portraits of ancestors, the room was a clutter of bric-a-brac. The mind of the 18th century was a mind loaded with monumental unimportances. It was a decadent period for art and literature. It is represented by some of the worst paintings of all time, and its music leaves much to be desired. The period was one of collective decadency.

But this same period produced a number of outstanding scientific thinkers: Charles Darwin, who managed to state the Darwinian theory in as many words as it was possible to bring to bear upon the subject; Herbert Spencer, a man of great idealism, loquacious in the extreme; and Huxley, who simply fell into a slough of words from which he never escaped.

Today we like to read things stated

briefly; we want the substance and essence. But in days when there were no automobiles, radios, or motion pictures, people wanted books that took three months to read, because they had nothing much else to do.

The master if not the father of this process of using words as a means of obscuring meanings, lived a little earlier, in the second half of the 18th Century: Immanuel Kant. Will Durant in his *Story of Philosophy* thus footnotes his chapter on Immanuel Kant: "Kant himself is hardly intelligible, because his thought is insulated with a bizarre and intricate terminology (hence the paucity of direct quotation in this chapter.)"

His contemporaries ridiculed Kant for his obscurity of style. It was stated in his own time that in the process of his philosophy Immanuel Kant had killed God. More accurately, I think, it could be said, he murdered language. In his performed acrobatics in the linguistic art he used words no one else ever wanted to use and no one ever used again, and his first book was 800 pages of small type, solid set. By the time you finish it you either understand everything, or nothing.

One possible reason why Immanuel Kant used large words was that he was a small man. Kant was about five feet tall, and like most undersized persons he felt the urge to be big, and this he could express in the vastness of the language of his time. Why then do we feel that Kant has made a great contribution? It is because, that underneath the words, when you get them disentangled, when you translate the translations, and come to the substance beneath these incredible words, you make the discovery that Immanuel Kant really knew more about philosophy than any man between the beginning of the 18th century and the present time. Kant must be elevated by his actual merits to a place only inferior to such philosophers as Plato and Buddha. He was a great thinker, despite



his unfortunate habit of obscuring his thoughts with words.

The man himself is worthy of some study to find out why one so brilliant used so complex a method of expression. In all probability it was the definite outcome of an inferiority complex; physically small and weak, he was constantly belittled by his contemporaries. He was also of slow mind; he matured slowly. Had Immanuel Kant died in his 50's he would not have left much behind him. At forty he had no idea he was going to be a philosopher, and at sixty-seven he was a philosopher. The one great ambition he had tried for years to fulfill was to be a professor. Each time he applied for a position he was refused, for he was of most unprepossessing appearance. Mousey is the term by which he has been described, with his grey coat and his one dignity, a man servant walking behind him holding an umbrella over his head. He did not exactly impress observers as being the stuff greatness is moulded from. But when he was eighteen he was old, Immanuel Kant said the secret of a great destiny was to decide what one intended to do, and then permit no force to interfere with the accomplishment of that end. He lived consistently with that premise. He permitted nothing to deviate him from any purpose that he had decided to achieve, and at last, after several rebuffs, he became a professor. He achieved that which he most desired, a professorship in logic and metaphysics.

Metaphysics he used in its most technical form, and his metaphysics is not to be considered as the metaphysics of today.

Immanuel Kant had reverence for only one science: with an almost fanatical devotion, he worshipped mathematics. Mathematics to him was Truth. It was the science that couldn't lie. All the philosophers who had gone before him could be wrong, but mathematics could not. He idolized the fact that three and three make six. It never occurred to him if the total had been called something else the digits would have added up to something different; and that



mathematics, like everything else that man fabricates, occasionally does fib. Numbers to him were infallible, the reasonable foundation for all thought and knowledge.

His writings present a marked contrast to those of the philosophers who preceded him—especially, say, to the philosophy of Francis Bacon. Lord Bacon, also a little man physically, was an optimist, an idealist. Bacon's philosophy was based upon the Platonic tolerance of thinking, it was great, gentle, noble. Philosophy made you sit back and see the good in everything, made you inclined to forgive the faults of others, most of all it preserved Deity. God was in his heaven, and all was right with the world. This philosophy of idealism dominated the close of the 17th Century and the early part of the 18th century; but when Immanuel Kant took up the problem of God's being in his heaven and all being right with the world, he tried to make it out and he couldn't. He tried to work it out with mathematics, but he couldn't get results. It never occurred to Kant to imagine things—and that is the reason why it was said he killed God. It was necessary to his mind that there be certain categories of knowledge, regardless of what they were, whether they were pessimistic or optimistic, whether idealistic or materialistic, and they must stand. Kant demanded a great philosophic integrity. To him honesty was a brutal fact. To Plato honesty was a gentle acceptance.

One of the first things Immanuel Kant had to think about was himself. His family had settled in Central Eu-



rope, but he was of Scottish ancestry, and from childhood he was what was called then 'an ailing youngster.' With the peculiar stubbornness and practical mind that is typically Scotch, when he didn't want to see something he couldn't see it, but when he wanted to see it he could; because in childhood his life was ever despaired of, and he was constantly collapsing, he recognized that he had to perpetuate and preserve his body, otherwise his mind would disappear with his body; so he decided for himself that the first law of health is to keep away from the doctor. During his whole life it was his boast he had never gone to a doctor no matter how sick he was; and by sheer force of will, the will to live, the will to achieve what he desired to achieve, Immanuel Kant took his frail and inadequate body and sustained it to age eighty. One of his essays is on will and purpose being dominant over the body, and he proved it in his own life.

A mathematician, and one with afflictions, it is natural that he should have lived a most ordered existence. It is said that he never broke a habit, nor deviated from it in the slightest degree. He believed, for instance, that for health he must breathe through his nose, and when walking out of doors, therefore he would not speak to his best friend because he would have had to open his mouth. If he had met the Emperor he would not have spoken. Another belief was that man's life to be long must be regular. At that time coffee was one of the elegancies, a luxury that few indulged in; but Kant had one cup of coffee at the same time every day without a variance of one minute for forty-six years. He went for a walk every afternoon at 3:30. Neighbors set their clocks by him.

During his entire period of professorship he was never known to be a little early or a little late to a meal, and over his entire lifetime he is never known to have done anything spontaneously. This somewhat depressed the romantic side of his life, as might be suspected. It is said that he fell in love twice, a state of mind and heart that interfered with his

prescribed routine of life, and he was very hesitant to make any change; so the first young lady he was enamoured of married someone else before he got around to it. The second one, whom he considered for a period of about ten years, finally moved away. The problem seemed to be that he ate at certain hours, and any interference would be definitely an irregularity in his program of living. He finally gave up the idea of personal romance entirely, in favor of a perfectly methodical existence, his outstanding personal achievement. He lived by the precision of mathematics.

This story is told of him, and probably is apocryphal: While he was an under-professor, one of his students on his death bed gasped, "Professor Kant, I think I is dying." Kant admonished the student, "Young man, do not say 'I is dying,' say 'I am dying.' If you must die, die grammatically."

It is easy to realize a type of mind having overwhelming orderliness of purpose would discipline the individual to live completely by habit, and Kant's living was divided between the classroom and his walks; he lived so vicariously that life as others know it seldom touched him. As the years went on these habits of method and order closed in upon him, and the man lived in a little world of his own, a world that feared only one thing, interruption. Out of this vicarious detachment remarkably came a philosophy that changed history, for it brought about all we know today as modernism.

So great was the change he brought about that men have never gone back to think as they previously believed. But Immanuel Kant died without ever knowing that he was going to change history. To him his work was a great and solemn duty, not to be accompanied by the flights of inspiration and intuition that marked the initiated classical philosophers. Although he came of a good orthodox family he was never close to God; to him the Universe was something to be looked at, analyzed, and studied—and so his philosophy was one very different; it is very difficult to





disprove; and it is essentially reasonable, because reason, pure reason, is the very substance of it.

Utter absence of any personal life, no doubt made Kant the impersonal oracle that he was. His was not a happy life because he was always immersed in the things he was trying to express and explain. Had he used words of one syllable he would have written a scripture; but because he used such long words he is now mostly studied in digested form. The average person does not know what he is writing about, and this is true of university professor and layman alike. But although exceedingly difficult to understand, when you do grasp what he is trying to say you realize his immense capacity for knowledge. He hit upon the fallacies of all times, exposing them ruthlessly with a vitriolic pen but one wholly passionless.

There is no story of Immanuel Kant; there's none to tell; he didn't do anything. The ordinary things that make up the life of the ordinary person never seemed to reach him. He was living impersonality. And if for that reason his philosophy lacks warmth, it nevertheless possesses an extraordinary force. Of the moderns he is one of the few great philosophers who began with a concept of the Universe and simply worked from the bottom up. Schopenhauer and Nietzsche were really philosophic psychologists. Their viewpoint did not embrace the foundation for the cosmos. Probably the simplest way of expressing the matter is to describe the difference between the Old Testament and the New. The Old Testament has a cosmogony, a creation myth, establish-

ing the origin of races and people. The New Testament, on the other hand, has none of these factors, but is a moral code. It is a philosophy, but one that demands the Old Testament for a background. Nearly all philosophers of modern times have written New Testaments; they have expressed moral viewpoints toward life, and have involved themselves in the behavior and the various neuroses of man. Immanuel Kant laid the roots of his philosophy in Space.

He gave a complete cosmogony and a complete story of existence. That is why he is one of a small group of philosophers of the moderns who deserves great recognition. His is a complete picture of the universe, and one in contradiction to a few people who had other ideas. His revelation is no simple primer; it is revelation that must be studied.

Kant was, so to speak, looking for something upon which to build a foundation. He was searching to find the axis, the support, the pedestal of the world; and searching through the various opinions of men from the beginning, he ran onto a great many familiar questions. "Mama, who created the world?" Mother, a little busy at the moment, says, "God created the world." Little Willie thinks a moment and then says, "Who created God?" And about that time mother becomes much more preoccupied than she was before. In more formal approach, what next follows is the great problem that has always existed in the mind of the West—of course, the East solved it in a different way—it is in the great question, Why? We can answer, evolution. But why is this necessary, if Deity or the Creative power can do anything it wanted to do?—why not make us perfect in the first place and skip all this vast interval of misfortune which we refer to as growing up in Space? If Deity was capable of creating the world, why did it create gangsters and dictators and other plagues to the flesh? If Deity, out of the immenseness of its wisdom, formed all these things, why does every-



thing live by destroying everything else?—even fleas have smaller fleas to bite them, and these in turn have even smaller fleas, *ad infinitum*—what is the reason for it? Why does life have to exist by struggling? Whatever put into man's head the idea to be rich? Why the idea that piety is necessary? Why is man so ignorant of his God he has to create a theology to discover Him? God can do anything he wants, then why did He not also walk on the earth in the cool of the evening? What was all the reason behind this peculiar state of misery that so many centuries called the will of God and which the moderns call the accidents of Nature? Why disease? Sickness? If it is payment for sin, why does one have to sin in the first place? Why is it necessary for man to make mistakes if he is made in the image of his Creator? Does God make mistakes?

As we look about us we wonder. Something obviously is not right. And yet the same scheme of war that engulfs the world today is also observable as taking place in a drop of water under a microscope. Creatures so infinitely small that their concerns matter nothing to us, in the drop of water are in a life struggle to exist. In the grain of sand, too, life is struggling to exist. And among men there is a prevailing ignorance as to why men are struggling to exist.

Immanuel Kant figured out these little issues. They had been not more than touched upon, certainly not fully treated, either by his contemporaries or by the idealists who see everything as good. And so they said Immanuel Kant killed God. He decided that God either did not exist as a moral force, or else as a moral force was exceedingly corrupt.

Buddha was confronted by the same problem 2500 years ago when the Brahmins asked him about evil. Buddha said, "If God does not prevent evil he is not good; if he cannot prevent evil he is not God." Kant facing this dilemma gave us the foundation of what we call mechanism. He didn't consummate the mechanistic theory of life—that was to come long after his time—but he

sowed the seeds. He could not accept the fact the Universe had always existed. It was an evolution. He could not find out who created it, because who ever did did not walk up and down the same street at 3:30 every afternoon. From the narrow environment of his professorship Kant looked out at the stars and the sky and tried to figure out Why?—the eternal question of man—Why? He looked. He could see, but he could not see why. Then he thought he knew what the trouble was, and it wasn't with Space. It was not the suns, stars, nor planets that were to blame, but the fact that *he* could not understand.

Most people looking for the reason of things look outwardly, but Kant realized the reason he did not know, and was never going to be able to know, was himself; that in all probability the answer to all the questions he couldn't think of were there, floating around in Space, but he had nothing to pick them up with.

He looked at things, saw them and knew they were there, but he knew he didn't really see them. What really happened was he received certain sensory impulses; when he picked up an apple his eye told him it was an apple; he smelled it and his nose told him it was an apple; he bit into it and his taste told him it was an apple; his sense of feeling told him it was the shape of an apple; so out of all these testimonies to an apple he decided he had an apple, which was reasonable.

But suppose there were things just as real as an apple that his sensory perceptions could not agree on?—some senses perceived it, and others rejected it. Then, confusion. He began to realize that man was a living, thinking, conscious creature connected to the universe about him eternally only by means of his five senses, five little windows, five little wires, five little eyes with which he had to explore Space—and these little eyes were peculiarly inept for the very thing for which he wanted to use them. He might want to use them but he couldn't: they could not examine Space.

So he had discovered the Universe





was not really to blame for most of the things it was blamed for, for man did not have the tools with which to see. This opened a very, very large field for the little professor; he had hit upon a great Truth, one which none of us fully understands. After centuries of civilization, today we still trust implicitly in the five little windows, and it seldom occurs to anyone to doubt the efficiency of those windows. We see something and it gives testimony; we touch something, and the testimony is supported; and so on; we add one sense to another until we have a series of sensations; but Kant found out there was something else. Even with all the senses working when you are looking at the apple, how do you know it is an apple? All that goes in is testimony, not an apple. It is not even a picture of an apple. It is not something round that your nerve impulses actually carry to the brain. Nor is it the taste of apple that the nerve carries to the brain. It is a series of impulses.

What makes an apple? Immanuel Kant thought about that on a good many afternoon walks at 3:30 sharp. What enables man through his sensory perceptions to take one substance and assert, "This is an apple." It never occurs to the average individual who says, "This is a chair," to wonder how he knows it is a chair. An actual chair does not go into the brain. A series of impulses cannot of themselves have any actual shape. Brought together, they are capable only of creating a pattern of a chair. We look at people but our brains do not see their faces; all that is received is a series of impulses; as these strike the brain they instantaneously create a pattern; and it is only thus that we 'see'

their faces.

So, everything we do depends upon the coming in of these messages, and upon something inside taking hold of these messages and making sense out of them.

We always overlook the obvious. It took Immanuel Kant to discover there was something mysterious in the supposed fact you could see a teacup. Everyone had seen teacups, but no one had questioned why he saw a teacup, and the answer anyhow would not come to he who runs, so Immanuel Kant walked slowly. He wanted to find out, what was it in man that made him capable of saying with assurance, "I see a teacup."

Out of his deliberations Kant divided life into two parts: the noumenal and phenomenal existence. The noumenal (the causal factor) is inside of man, and is the estimator and the weigher. The phenomenal is the thing outside of man which must be estimated and weighed. So, phenomenal impulses are constantly going into the noumenal; and equally constantly the noumenal is sending out reflexes and reactions... And that seems very simple, but it is not so simple as he tells it in 300 pages.

We are now presented with a number of important problems. We are made the victims of our own sensory perceptions. When the eyes go, we become blind; a part of the world is cut off from us. To the degree that sensory perceptions are developed the impulses are correct; but even if all five senses are developed and bear testimony, we have not seen all—intangible things are not susceptible of being felt, tasted, or seen. Intangibles remain mysteries, not because they are really mysteries, but because we have no way of estimating them.

The Universe, according to Kant, is mathematical, is absolute order, is absolute consistency. Two important things about the Universe we can in a way grasp. One is Time. Now, Time is a pet illusion of some schools, and the pet reality of others. Time creates the possibility of a sequence. Suppose you had



six dozen cards and on each you wrote a date significant in some well known man's life, adding some circumstance of his life corresponding to each date. Shuffling the seventy-two cards you then throw them up in the air and pick them up in the order you find them. It is possible you might thus read that he died before he was born. This will not do; so you re-sort the cards according to dates, and when you get through you read them. They now record the correct pattern of his life.

Time is the measure of the sequences of circumstances and incidences. For instance, the Old Testament in the original Hebrew form was written without present tense or future tense. That has left us very uncertain about biblical chronology. With the time factor missing, we do not know when things happened. Time is very significant in enabling us to place occurrences and allowing us to build sequentially. But, Time as we know it is swallowed up in eternity, and is only a devisement of man. And yet, whether it is a devisement of man or whether it is a reality, time is necessary as one of the estimating factors of the Universe.

Place is the other important thing. What is located in place and in time is capable of definition. If it is not in place nor in time it is not capable of definition.

One of his contemporaries defined Immanuel Kant as an active verb, to which there was no passive form. His mind was constantly digging into things, trying to line up the Universe as Law and Order, as Time and Place, as Sequence and Circumstance, and in his *Critique of Pure Reason*, which is not a critical work but a statement of a great many facts, we are given not only formulas, but solutions.

A philosophy to be great must not only teach you what is wrong, but what you can do about it. If something is in existence and you destroy it without something better to take its place, you are guilty of vandalism. No one should tear down until he has something better to put in the place of the thing de-

stroyed. No great system of philosophy merely tells someone they are wrong; it tells what is the right solution to the problem. Kant is very sincere in his effort to point to proper action, both in the accumulation of facts, and the assimilation of knowledge.

Kant asked, "What is right and what is wrong?" You can not depend on human statutes, because right and wrong among men is a matter of custom, habit, tradition, of advantage, of policy. All the laws and statutes on the law books are presumably founded upon an ethics of right and wrong, and it is obvious if you rob the First National Bank you are not doing what you ought to do. What is right? To most people it is what they can get away with. That is not solutionary. Someone else says it is to obey a series of Commandments, or rules; Kant was not interested in the "Thou shalt not's."

He said, "How should you live as a person?" and his answer was satisfying. You are part of the Universe. You are part of time and place. You are a fragment existing upon a greater fragment. Therefore, if you want to exist you have to play the game according to the great fragment, and right or wrong is agreement with or departure from the morals and ethics of all manifestation of the greater part. In other words, if you agree with the pattern of the world you are right. If you disagree with the pattern of the world you are wrong. And if you disagree you will be punished by the world, not by men.

So Kant, as would the Taoist, advises the individual to pattern his conduct after the Universe rather than after the dictates of man. (There was a time he could have lost his head for that, but the little professor was so short his head probably wasn't in sight.) Buried under phraseology is this peculiar thing as one of his Categories: Live as an individual in such a way if the Universe were ruled by the same impulses that rule you, everything in the Universe would be justly and fairly treated. In other words, so live that if your conduct became universal law, nothing in the Uni-



verse would suffer. That is a very difficult proposition. One party gets up and says, "We believe we should be Fascists." How can you be a Fascist in such a way that, Fascism having become the Law of Nature, all men and all creatures, even the smallest bug, would have their perfect rights. How could you make Aristocracy a law, and at the same time see that the poorest and humblest man would not only not lose anything but would be given the greatest opportunity to grow? Go to the other side, join the people who are Communist—well, really Neo-Communitic. If Communism became the Law of the Universe, if it shone down upon us as the sun, would everything from the smallest bug to the greatest star still have a fair, honest, reasonable and protective law governing it?

In other words, if you lost your temper and you were God, there would probably be a great deal of excitement in Space. If you want to be a god you cannot lose your temper.

Some men want to accumulate. If you were to make a Universal Law out of Accumulation, would it still provide everybody with that which they need?

Suppose you want to reform people and tell them they all have to get down on their knees and pray at half past six. Would that make a good Universal Law? Would you want to live under it if you created it? Is it conceivable that the whole Universe, including the sun, moon, and stars would go into theology? Is it conceivable that the great Suns up in Space are arguing about their religious denominations? Well, if they are not arguing over religious denominations, why should we? Anything less than Universal Law is not worth bothering with.

Immanuel Kant thought over the problem of just what is important. He began to realize most of the things human beings delight in are either contrary to or at least do not do much to help the Laws of Life. He also became aware of the stupendous rationalism of things just the way they are. It is man's



duty to fit into this purpose, this Universal Plan, this Rational Pattern, which he proves mentally but may not prove morally.

Now, Kant had a number of long words for a number of his ideas which I do not think we need to bother with because they do not tell much. Simpler words will do. A problem that Kant was never able to completely remove from his consciousness was, the impersonality of the Universe. He was an impersonal man, in his way, and he was dominated by the realization the Universe did not need personality. Personality was a rather sloppy thing at best, and people who have a lot of what is called personality generally have a lot of enemies. Personality was one of the illusions of the idealist he did not believe in. He did not believe in building dominating personalities. He did not believe the individual should try to develop a personality—it was all a waste of time.

Out of the impersonality of Space the mechanists have derived a gorgeous theory, but their theory is not really Kant's. They do not even know what he is talking about. They do not see he is speaking from a viewpoint they never had. Their mechanism is the most depressing thing we have; it is well that Kant did not live to see the mechanistic theory that hopelessly dominates so large a part of education.

During the first half of the 19th Century came another theory; out of Kant came Huxley, Darwin, Spencer, and other scientists, and from the premise he set down these men decided to remove God from the Universe. Today





we see the products of that thinking. As you look around you, you see modernism, merely a name for materialism, rampant. Writers, musicians and artists have stepped down from the high pedestal of culture to wallow in what they call realism, in the assumption the worst is real, and the best is illusion. That came out of Kant, not because he intended it to be that way, but because small minds taking hold of his thoughts could do no better. He had broken only with the belief of the omnipotence of Deity. It was a group of men who came after him who finally exterminated God entirely.

Of course, the logical, happy thought about it is, it doesn't make any difference what anybody thinks, the facts remain; and if the materialists do not want to believe them, they, like the ostrich, (although the ostrich never really does it) hide their heads in the sand. Regardless of unbelievers, nothing is changed. Kant knew that. He knew no matter how much you might will a thing to be, you could not change things. This is contrary to the teachings of

Schopenhauer and Nietzsche. The one hopeful thing about our materialists is, it makes no difference, materialism or no materialism, the Universe is what it is.

What Kant did not try was to remove the Creator of the Universe. He tried rather to prove the Universe was ruled by a Principle, and not by a person; by Laws rather than whims; by Reason rather than by despotism; and out of a misunderstanding of his philosophy has come modern materialism.

Today we are beginning to dream. Tomorrow we will see some of these ideals re-stated. We shall come again to see as Kant saw. We shall realize he was right when he impersonalized God, when he said God is a Principle not a person, that Deity is the Reality behind the world, and that Deity is manifesting through Law and made visible through form; that the Universe is the embodiment of Principles, and that the God who was the Father of all, was not a fretful old man, hardening Pharaoh's heart, but rather an immutable Principle, Reality, Idealism, Wisdom, Virtue, Beauty, and that in the true sense God is coming of Age through his creatures.

The Law which formed all things became men and creatures, and gradually through men and creatures these Laws are learning to know themselves; and when they know enough about themselves, they will establish themselves as the Rulers of the world.

Kant did a great work. Although misinterpreted and misunderstood, as all great men have been, upon the foundation of his impersonal God we shall sometime restore the great philosophic institutions of the past.

(CONDENSATION FROM A PUBLIC LECTURE  
Suggested reading: FIRST PRINCIPLES OF PHILOSOPHY.)

## *The Absolute Standard of Beauty*

TO the philosopher, divinity itself is the absolute standard of all perfection. One philosopher said, "Only God is good." And in another age another philosopher said, "Only God is beautiful." By the term God we must understand the all-knowing, all-animating spirit of the world by whose wisdom universal Law is maintained.

The beauties of nature and man, therefore, are really the beauty of God in nature and God in man.

— Manly Hall, in *First Principles of Philosophy*



- *If it is not to let Christianity down, democracy must be tremendously more efficient in the service of the common man*

## Practical Religion In The World Of Tomorrow

BY HENRY A. WALLACE

*Vice President of the United States*

THERE are three great philosophies in the world today. The first, based on the supremacy of might over right, says that war between nations is inevitable until such time as a single master race dominates the entire world and everyone is assigned his daily task by an arrogant, self-appointed Fuehrer.

The second—the Marxian philosophy—says that class warfare is inevitable until such time as the proletariat comes out on top, everywhere in the world, and can start building a society without classes.

The third—which we in this country know as the democratic Christian philosophy—denies that man was made for war, whether it be war between nations or war between classes, and asserts boldly that ultimate peace is inevitable, that all men are brothers, and that God is their Father.

This democratic philosophy pervades not only the hearts and minds of those who live by the Christian religion, both Protestant and Catholic, but of those who draw their inspiration from Mohammedanism, Judaism, Hinduism, Confucianism and other faiths. When we look beneath the outer forms, we find that all these faiths, in one way or another, preach the doctrine of the dignity of each individual human soul, the doctrine that God intended man to be a good neighbor to his fellow man, and the doctrine of the essential unity of the entire world.

Those who think most about individualism preach freedom. Those who think most about unity, whether it be the unity of a nation or of the entire world, preach the sacred obligation of duty.

There is a seeming conflict between freedom and duty, and it takes the spirit of democracy to resolve it. Only through religion and education can the freedom-loving individual realize that his greatest private pleasure comes from serving the highest unity, the general welfare of all.

This truth, the essence of democracy, must capture the hearts of men over the entire world, if human civilization is not to be torn to pieces in a series of wars and revolutions far more terrible than anything that has yet been endured.

Democracy is the hope of civilization.

To understand the significance of these three philosophies dominant in the world today, let us look at each one in turn.

During the last 80 years, the outstanding exponent of the sacredness and inevitability of war has been Prussia. By nature the common people of Prussia are simple and hard-working, and make excellent citizens except where they have become infected by the Prussian doctrine that might makes right. The Prussian philosophy causes its adherents to practice many of the highest virtues, but these virtues are all ultimately placed at the disposal of supreme evil.

Hitler, seizing the Prussian militaristic tradition as a powerful instrument in his hands and putting it to use with his own religious frenzy, has become the anti-Christ of this generation—perhaps the most complete anti-Christ who has ever lived. It is not enough to bring about the downfall of Hitler. We must understand the origin and growth of the Prussian spirit, and do something to counteract that spirit, if we wish to bring permanent peace.



The Prussian attitude toward war and supremacy has strong roots. Whether it reaches back to the days of Caesar, or whether it first took form under the guidance of the Teutonic knights in the Middle Ages, we are certain of this: by the time of Frederick the Great, the Prussians consciously adopted the doctrine of total war and the total state as the chief end of man. Bismarck and Kaiser Wilhelm II. modernized and made completely deceitful and ruthless that which Frederick the Great had founded.

Shortly after Kaiser Wilhelm II. rose to power, a generation before the first World War, one of the more tender-hearted of the German generals said, in addressing his troops: "Our civilization must build its temple on mountains of corpses, an ocean of tears, and the groans of innumerable dying men."

We know now, to our sorrow, that those were not just idle words.

Bernhardi and Treitschke, through the printed page and through the classroom, preached the glory of war and the necessity of Germany picking a quarrel with England or France. Frederick the Great, Moltke and Bismarck were proclaimed as being superior to Goethe, Schiller, Bach and Beethoven.

Hegel laid broad and deep the philosophy of the totalitarian state.

Other philosophers, and especially Nietzsche, seized on the Darwin doctrines of natural selection and survival of the fittest to erect a seemingly scientific but false materialism to justify their ruthless acts.

In saying all of this, I do not mean to indicate that Prussia was the only wicked State in the world. England, France, Russia, Spain, and the United States were not always perfect. But Prussia and Japan were the only countries which systematically devoted the highest virtues of their citizenry, generation after generation, to the glorification of the State and to the ruthlessness of war.

The ancestors of many of the people of German origin in the United States were

members of the minority in Germany who dissented from the extremist tendencies toward militarism. Thousands of these dissenters migrated to this country in the twenty or thirty years after the failure of the revolution of 1848. Their children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren today are among our finest American citizens. They are patriotically doing their part in the present war for freedom.

It is in the years since 1848 that the liberal culture of the old Germany has been so completely submerged by the worship of strength and power. In this period of less than a century, under Bismarck, Kaiser Wilhelm II., and Hitler, Germany has launched five aggressive wars.

The result has been that, over the last thirty years, the spirit of Prussianism has cost the lives of at least 20 million men, has crippled at least 10 million others. And has caused the nations of the world to squander hundreds of billions of dollars on death, destruction and hate. How different things would have been if this money had been spent instead on peace, prosperity and understanding!

Germans by blood are neither better nor worse than Englishmen, Americans, Swedes, Poles, or Russians. But the Prussian tradition of the last century, and especially the Nazi education of the last ten years, have created a psychic entity so monstrous and so dangerous to the entire world that it is absolutely





vital to exercise some control over German education when the war comes to an end. Prussian schoolmasters have been of greater importance to the German army than Prussian captains, and Prussian textbooks have had greater value than ammunition.

It is the disciplined will to power and the worship of war as the method of power that have made the German army such a terrible instrument of force. Just as Hitler took the Prussian military tradition and organized it into gangsterism, so he took the Prussian education system and streamlined it to marshal the millions of German boys and girls behind his evil conspiracy of world conquest.

Hitler's children have been trained to believe implicitly that the State is more important than the individual, and that the individual must be willing and ready to sacrifice himself for the German Nation and for the Fuehrer. Starting with the young mothers and fathers, married or unmarried, and taking the children through the day nurseries and a series of schools for different ages, Hitler has indoctrinated the German children with what he calls his "leadership principle"—that among men as in nature there is an eternal struggle between the weak and the strong, and that the "decadent" democracies are destined to crumble before the superior might of the Nazi elite.

German boys have been systematically trained in brutality.

German girls have been systematically trained to believe that their supreme duty is to be mothers, married or unmarried, of children dedicated to the service of the Fatherland and the Fuehrer.

Through the use of mystic ceremonies—pagan dances, bonfires, sun festivals on mountain tops, and many other types of ritual—both boys and girls have been trained to look upon Hitler as divine, and they pray to him as God.

The evil influence of this systematic degradation of millions of German boys and girls can not be counteracted in a short time. Even Hitler's death will not

end it, because many of Hitler's children, conditioned as they are, will believe that he is still their leader, in the spirit if not in the flesh.

Hitler dead may be almost as dangerous as Hitler alive.

This, then, is the vastly difficult problem with which the United Nations will have to cope, if the victory which now is coming closer is to bring more than just a short breathing spell before another Prussian attack is launched upon the world.

It is not up to the United Nations to say just what the German schools of the future should teach; and we do not want to be guilty of a Hitler-like orgy of book burning. But it is vital to the peace of the world to make sure that neither Prussianism, Hitlerism nor any modification of them is taught.

There are many cultured German scholars with an excellent attitude toward the world who should be put to work on the job of rewriting the German textbooks in their own way. I believe these men would glorify peace and international honesty, reestablishment of the German culture of Beethoven, Schubert, Schiller, and Goethe, and the gradual preparation of the German spirit for an appreciation of the fact that a Bill of Rights for the individual is as vital as a Bill of Duties toward the State.

Doubtless thousands of German boys will come home from the war bitterly disillusioned of Prussianism and Hitlerism. Thousands of both young and old





at home will feel the same way. They will honestly want to help build up a new democratic Germany, and we, without yielding at all to the old warlike spirit of Prussia, should encourage them to try. We shall need the help of all Germans who give convincing evidence that they do not subscribe to the 'master race' myth, and are genuinely opposed to the doctrine that might makes right.

The re-education we insist upon should not crush out any sincere desire to practice democracy and live at peace among the world family of nations.

It will not be necessary for Americans to teach in the German schools. The all-important thing is to see that the cult of war and international deceit is no longer preached as a virtue in the schools.

We cannot countenance the soft, lazy forgetfulness which characterized England and France in their treatment of Germany in the thirties. The cost of such short-sighted appeasement is too great in men and money. We must not go down that mistaken, tragic road again.

Now, about Marxianism. This philosophy in some ways is the child of Prussianism, because Marx, its high priest, was molded in his thinking by Hegel, the great philosopher of the Prussian state.

Marxianism has used the Cheka, just as Prussianism has used the Gestapo, but it has never preached international war as an instrument of national policy. It does not believe one race is superior to another. Many of the Marxian activities of the last ten years which people of the West have most condemned have been inspired by fear of Germany. The Russian people, who are the chief believers in Marxianism, are fundamentally more religious than the Prussians. The great mass of the Russian people is still hungry for spiritual food. The Russians have a better opportunity to find that spiritual food than have the Prussians under their regime, which glorifies the violence of the old Teutonic gods.

This question of religious freedom in Russia has been getting attention from the Church of England and from the Roman Catholic Church in this country. In a recent issue of the magazine *Commonwealth*, which surely can not be said to have Marxian leanings, the managing editor discussed two books by exiled Russians on the status of religion in Russia. Quoting from both books, one written under the auspices of the Church of England, and the other by a professor at Fordham University, the editor came to the conclusion that the position of the Christian Church in Russia has definitely improved.

The future well-being of the world depends upon the extent to which Marxianism, as it is being progressively modified in Russia, and democracy, as we are adapting it to twentieth century conditions, can live together in peace. Old-line Marxianism has held that democracy is mere words, that it serves the cause of the common man with platitudes rather than with jobs, and that belief in it results in a weak governmental organization. And we who believe in democracy, must admit that modern science, invention, and technology have provided us with new bottles into many of which we have not yet poured the wine of the democratic spirit.

In some respects both the Prussians and the Russians have perceived the signs of the times better than we—and I hope that reactionary politicians will not quote this sentence out of its context, in an effort to prove that I have come out for dictatorship! The fact is, that the Prussians have done an effective job of making their bureaucrats efficient in coordinating the social forces in the service of the state. The Russians have put great emphasis on serving and gaining the enthusiastic adherence of the common man.

It is my belief that democracy is the only true expression of Christianity, but if it is not to let Christianity down, democracy must be tremendously more efficient than it has been in the service of the common man, and in resistance



to selfish pressure groups.

After this war is over, the democratic capitalistic nations will need to prove that they are supremely interested in full employment and full utilization of natural resources. They will need to demonstrate that the consuming power of their people can be made to equal their productive power.

The right to work at a regular job and for a decent wage is essential to the true dignity of man. If the Western democracies furnish full employment and an expanding production, they need have no fear of a revival of old-line communistic propaganda from within.

If they do not furnish full employment, communistic propaganda of this kind is inevitable, and there is nothing which the Russian government or our government or any other government can do to stop it. In the event of long-continued unemployment, the only question will be as to whether the Prussian or Marxian doctrine will take us over first.

I believe in the democratic doctrine—the religion based on the social message of the prophets, the heart insight of Christ, and the wisdom of the men who drew up the Constitution of the United States and adopted the Bill of Rights. By tradition and by structure we believe that it is possible to reconcile the freedom and rights of the individual with the duties required of us by the general welfare. We believe in religious tolerance and the separation of church and state, but we need to light again the old spirit to meet the challenge of new facts.

We shall decide some time in 1943 or 1944 whether to plant the seeds for World War Three. That war will be certain if we allow Prussia to rearm either materially or psychologically.

That war will be probable in case we double-cross Russia.

That war will be probable if we fail to demonstrate that we can furnish full employment after this war comes to an end and fascist interests motivated largely by anti-Russian bias get control of our government.



Unless the western democracies and Russia come to a satisfactory understanding before the war ends, I very much fear that World War Three will be inevitable. Without a close and trusting understanding between Russia and the United States, there is grave probability after this war is over of Russia and Germany sooner or later making common cause.

Of course the ground for World War Three can be laid by actions of the other powers, even though we in the United States follow the most constructive course.

For example, such a war would be inevitable if Russia should again embrace the Trotskyist idea of fomenting worldwide revolution; or if British interests should again be sympathetic to anti-Russian activity in Germany and other countries.

Another possible cause of World War Three might rise out of our own willingness to repeat the mistakes we made after World War One. When a creditor nation raises its tariffs and asks foreign nations to pay up, and at the same time refuses to let them pay in goods, the result is irritation of a sort that sooner or later leads first to trade war and then to bloodshed.

The gospel of Christ was to feed the hungry, clothe the naked, comfort the sick, and visit those who were in hard luck. He said that treating your neighbor decently was the way to show that you loved God.

The neighborhood in Christ's day was a few miles in diameter. Today the



airplane has made the whole world a neighborhood. The Good Neighbor policy, whether at home or abroad, is a Christian policy.

Those who preach isolationism and hate of other nations are preaching a modified form of Prussian Nazism, and the only outcome of such preaching will be war.

If we want peace, we must treat other nations in the spirit of democratic Christianity. We must make our religion practical.

In our relations with China, for example, we must act in such a way as to enhance the material as well as the spiritual well-being of her people. So doing will not only be of spiritual advantage to ourselves, will not only do much to prevent war, but will give us more material prosperity than we can otherwise enjoy. And in saying this, I do not preach the missionary spirit as a forerunner of a new imperialism.

Nearly half the people of the world live in eastern Asia. Seven-eighths of them do not know how to read and write, but many of them listen to the radio and they know that the world is on the move, and they are determined to move with it. We can at their request help them to move in knowledge toward a higher standard of living rather than in ignorance toward confusion and anarchy.

Throughout history, every big nation has been given an opportunity to help

itself by helping the world. If such an opportunity is seized with a broad and generous spirit, an infinitude of practical possibilities opens up.

Thousands of business men in the United States have seen this kind of thing happen on a smaller scale in their own business, as their broad and enlightened policies have increased their prosperity and given jobs to their neighbors. Christianity is not star gazing or foolish idealism. Applied on a world-wide scale, it is intensely practical. Bread cast upon the waters does return. National friendships are remembered. Help to starving people is not soon forgotten.

We of the United States who now have the greatest opportunity that ever came to any people do not wish to impose on any other race or to thrust our money or technical experts or ways of thought on those who do not desire them. But we do believe that if we measure up to the responsibility which Providence has placed on our shoulders, we shall be called on for help by many peoples who admire us.

When we respond to this cry for help, we shall be manifesting not only a Christian spirit, but also obeying a fundamental law of life.

We of the Western democracies must demonstrate the practicality of our religion. We must extend a helping hand to China and India; we must be firm and just with Prussia; we must deal honestly and fairly with Russia and be tol-

5 INCHES  
set aside on your bookshelves  
will hold Manly Hall's four  
great basic books

*(See coupon on following page)*



erant and even helpful as she works out her economic problems in her own way. We must prove that we ourselves can give an example, in our American democratic way, of full employment and full production for the benefit of the common man.

By collaborating with the rest of the world to put productive resources fully

to work, we shall raise our own standard of living, and help to raise the standard of living of others. It is not that we shall be taking the bread out of the mouths of our own children to feed the children of others, but that we shall co-operate with everyone to call forth the energies of everyone, to put God's earth more completely at the service of all mankind.

(FROM A PUBLIC ADDRESS)

### Wallace's 'Screw' Ideas

VICE PRESIDENT Henry A. Wallace is to many an impractical visionary, a bit of a mystic and dreamer. Strictly for your own amazement, however, you might sometime care to check back on the record of Wallace's screw ideas of the past, just to see how they turned out.

Take just the idea of the "ever normal granary." Remember how fantastic that sounded when it was first presented back in 1933? The idea of storing surpluses against lean years looked ridiculous. Yet along came the drouths of 1934 and 1936.

Good crop years did finally build up the carryover stocks to peaks of 700,000,000 bushels of corn in 1940 and 600,000,000 bushels of wheat in 1942, and the cry went up that the government was going to be left holding the bag.

Yet along came the war, and it is these very surpluses which may provide salvation as feed crops for increased livestock demands.

The theory of Henry Wallace's ever normal granary has worked, and all that can be asked of any contraption or gadget or theory of economics is that it work. The same thing goes for the much cursed and discussed Triple A—it was born out of the depths of depression, a Wallace sponsored brainchild. It was killed by the Supreme Court in 1936. It was revived in the new AAA act of 1938.

Balancing the books over the last 10 years, Wallace's ideas have been right far oftener than they have been wrong.

— Peter Edson

---

*Cut along this line; it will not injure the editorial contents of the magazine*

PHILOSOPHICAL RESEARCH SOCIETY, INC.

3341 GRIFFITH PARK BLVD., LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

BOOKSHELF SPECIAL

SAVE \$1.50

I enclose \$10.00 (plus 30c sales tax if yours is a California address) for

1 copy, FIRST PRINCIPLES OF PHILOSOPHY.....	\$2.00
1 copy, SELF-UNFOLDMENT .....	2.00
1 copy, HOW TO UNDERSTAND YOUR BIBLE.....	2.50
1 copy, PURPOSEFUL LIVING —	

LECTURES ON ANCIENT PHILOSOPHY..... 5.00

\$10.00 for the four books, regularly — \$11.50

NAME.....

ADDRESS.....

CITY..... STATE.....



# 5-inch Bookshelf -- 4 Books \$10.

(BOUGHT SEPARATELY \$11.50)

(YOU SAVE \$1.50)

---

## How to *Understand* Your Bible

It is important to remember that nearly every personality described or discussed in the Bible is primarily a symbol and not an historical individual. The Christian Bible is the greatest book in English literature. But like most other great books, it must be approached with understanding, gentleness, impersonality, and a sincere desire to find truth.

239 PAGES — AUTOGRAPH EDITION — \$2.50

---

## SELF-UNFOLDMENT BY DISCIPLINES OF REALIZATION

How to develop the inward perceptions that release and perfect your higher ideals, give you mastery over circumstance, enrich your daily living... The philosophy of disciplined thinking and feeling.

224 PAGES — FIRST EDITION — \$2

---

## First Principles Of Philosophy

The first step in the organization of thought is to reduce the complexity of knowledge to a more or less simple program. The author has taught philosophy for twenty years to thousands of students.

190 PAGES -- ENLARGED EDITION -- \$2

---

### LECTURES ON ANCIENT PHILOSOPHY



## Purposeful Living . . . *An Introduction to Practical Ideals*

"My closest associates have many times told me that they consider this the most valuable book of any of the 56 I have written in re-statement of the Eternal Truth."

—MANLY P. HALL

471 PAGES — EMBOSSED BINDING — \$5.00